

Appl. No. 10/628,737

Response dated April 1, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 3, 2005

## **REMARKS**

1. Introduction. Claims 16 – 24 are in the case. Claim 10 has been withdrawn from consideration. New claims 16 – 24 have been added.

2. The Specification. The Examiner objected to the Abstract, stating that the Abstract compared the invention to the prior art and used terms which could be implied. The Abstract has been amended to remove the language to which the Examiner objected.

3. The Claims.

The Examiner objected to certain claims because of informalities in the claims. All of the informalities have been addressed by changes to the claims that are reflected in the new listing of the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 11 and 15. The Examiner objected to claims 3 – 5, 7 – 9, and 12 – 14, stating that these claims contained allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten to eliminate any reference to rejected base claims. Applicant has therefore rewritten the allowed claims so as to place them in form for allowance. For ease of reference the table below indicates the correspondence, where applicable, between the original claims and the new claims.

### **Table Showing Correspondence between Old and New claims**

Appl. No. 10/628,737

Response dated April 1, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 3, 2005

<b>Original Claim Number</b>	<b>New Claim Number</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	NA	Cancelled
2	NA	Cancelled
3	16	Rewritten as an independent claim, new claim 16 now includes all limitations of original claims 1 and 2, which were the base claims to original claim 3.
4	17	Formerly depended from claim 3, now depends from new claim 16.
5	18	Formerly depended from claim 4, now depends from new claim 17.
6	NA	Cancelled
7	19	Rewritten as an independent claim, new claim 19 now includes all limitations of original claim 1, which was the base claim to original claim 7.
8	20	Formerly depended from claim 2, now depends from new claim 16.
9	21	Formerly depended from claim 3, now depends from new claim 16.
10	NA	Withdrawn
11	NA	Cancelled
12	22	Rewritten as an independent claim, new claim 22 now includes all limitations of original claim 11, which was the base claim to original claim 12.

Appl. No. 10/628,737

Response dated April 1, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 3, 2005

<b>Original Claim Number</b>	<b>New Claim Number</b>	<b>Comments</b>
13	23	Formerly depended from claim 12, now depends from new claim 22.
14	24	Formerly depended from claim 13, now depends from new claim 23.
15	NA	Cancelled

4. Conclusion. Applicant has responded to all of the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action. Based on the above amendments and remarks I believe that all of the claims remaining in the case are allowable and an early Notice of Allowability is respectfully

Appl. No. 10/628,737

Response dated April 1, 2005

Reply to Office Action dated January 3, 2005

requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference will expedite the disposition of this matter the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact this attorney at the number shown below.

Respectfully submitted



Russel O. Primeaux

Reg. No. 37,213

KEAN, MILLER, HAWTHORNE, D'ARMOND,  
MCCOWAN & JARMAN, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 3513

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3513

Telephone: (225) 387-0999

Fax: (225) 388-9133

Email: [russel.primeaux@keanmiller.com](mailto:russel.primeaux@keanmiller.com)

[www.keanmiller.com](http://www.keanmiller.com)

Dated: April 1, 2005